

CONNOLLY'S CASE.

an entirely new system of government, to consist of four men, only one of whom was to be elected by the people. Counsel then reviewed the legislation and the action of the Board of supervisors had proceeded to show that the Board of supervisors had never been sued as a corporation. He then returned to the question as to who had control of the bonds in question.

mere tax commissioners. The 'comptroller issued no bonds. The State ordered the bonds issued by the law passed by its Legislature, and as matter of fact the bonds were sold by the State of New York and the amount to see they are paid. It is true they are to be repaid by a tax on the inhabitants of the city and county of New York, but the bonds were issued by the State, and the rights and liabilities of corporation, in ancient times they were independent of the State, but this is not the case now. The State is a corporation, and a municipal corporation to the State is independent of the State no longer. They are allowed by the laws of the State to raise money by taxes for local use, but if they do not do so, the State is bound to make them do so to build a court house and devote it to building a market in Buffalo it could do so. The State owns the right to regulate, is powerful over all other authorities in the State, and the State is the authority which is entirely correct in proving this doctrine and which sustain the right of our action.

Mr. BRACH, after complimenting the counsel for the very interesting history he had recited, claimed that it had no relevancy to the case before the court, and that the facts and the interpretation needed of the act passed by the Legislature, because it was perfectly plain, and it was the duty of all civilians to obey it. He stated that he was not a member of the authority in our State. He referred to the argument made by his associate, and compared it with that made by the counsel on the other side and also with the facts of the case. He then stated that he then recited the facts in the case of Connolly, his official duties and the requirements of him as Comptroller, repeating his argument made before the Court. The Court here took a recess until half-past seven o'clock.

In reassembling Mr. Brach resumed his argument, claiming that counsel on the other side had not shown by proper evidence the least implication or collusion of his client in any fraud.

At the conclusion of his address the Court took the

WILLIAM M. TWEED.

The Case of the "Boss" Before the General Term

at Albany—Argument on the Motion to
Vacate the Order of Arrest
Adjourned to Friday.

ALBANY, N. Y., Jan. 5, 1872.

At the opening of the Supreme Court this morning H. Reynolds, or counsel for William M. Tweed, stated that notice had been given of argument on appeal from Judge Learned's decision refusing to vacate the order of arrest of Mr. Tweed, but he said the defendant's counsel were not ready to argue the case this morning, and had so notified the court on the other side.

Mr. O'CONOR, of counsel for the people, stated that notice of this argument had been given him, and a stipulation entered into to have the case heard to-day. Last evening he received notice undermanning the stipulation, but he had replied that he could not agree to the countermand; that he was ready to make argument, and would appear here to argue in favor of a dismissal of the appeal.

Mr. REYNOLDS said he had not been made aware of the determination of Mr. O'Connor until now. Mr. Burrill, who was to make the argument for defendant, was absent, detained by another case in New York. If the cause was to be argued now he desired time at least to telegraph to him. He was himself unprepared to argue the case. He

had no papers, besides, this case was not on the calendar. The case of Connolly, for the argument of which counsel were here, involved nearly or quite all the points of the Tweed case, and might be argued now with profit. All he asked was that the case of Tweed be laid aside for the present.

Mr. O'Connor replied that counsel were ready for argument down to the time of countermanding

the stipulation, I then informed them that I could not admit of a postponement. I am not desirous of shutting out the argument of counsel, but I am anxious to have the case argued. It is true the Connolly case involves some of the questions involved in that of Tweed, with trifling exceptions, and I am ready to argue that case except as to one point, but it will take me

Only a short time to prepare for that. That point was a novel one, one which had never been argued before any Court. He thought these cases should be heard together.

MR. COUNTEY, counsel for Connolly, thought these cases should not be heard together. A portion of the cases were entirely different. He came to the court with a full case, sustained by affidavits and evidence, and he thought it would be better to have the cases heard on a mere complaint. We hold that the cases should be heard together, and sent.

Mr. BEACH, of the counsel for Connolly, said he had procured an adjournment in a case in New York for the purpose of appearing here to argue this case. He was under an agreement to appear in New York to-morrow, and the Court would see the necessity for going on with this case.

After some further conversation the Court decided to hear arguments in the Connolly case and postpone that of Tweed until Friday next.

TWEED'S BAIL

Everything Satisfactory, Except that "Youna Dick" Must Record the Deeds of the Property His Father Gave Him—Opinion of Judge Cardozo.

The matter of the \$1,000,000 bail required of Wil-

Sam M. Tweed has at length reached a final, and, no doubt, to the parties mostly concerned, satisfactory conclusion. Judge Cardozo, of the Supreme Court, yesterday accepted the sureties offered. He exacts as to young "Dick" Tweed, however, the condition that he record the deeds of the property transferred to him by his father. Accompanying this decision was the following:

I think, upon a fair and reasonable test, the sureties, exclusive of Mr. Richard M. Tweed, make up one million, giving just allowance to any contingent liability of Mr. Devlin by reason of his being surety for the performance of contracts where the work is not yet completed. The possibility that he might still, in some way, be liable on the completed ones is quite too remote to have any weight. If such possibilities were to disqualify few men could ever

surety ball at all, except in very inconsiderable
 amounts. This view also applies and disposes of
 some of the other grounds upon which a property
 and the value placed upon the property
 proposed sureties. Moreover, upon it by the
 including Mr. Richard Tweed, if he is to be accepted
 at all, two full sureties in the requisite amount are
 made up. I think there is no force in the point sug-
 gested by Mr. Peckham, that the other sureties
 could derive no aid from Mr. Tweed. The status

The other point suggested for my consideration is raised upon the objection that the property which young Mr. Tweed owns was acquired by gift from his father. The learned counsel cited no authority against his competency on that ground, and I have never been able to find any, although I have looked very carefully. There seems to be no doubt that the gift is a legal one.

rested in Mr. Tweed's answer, and the time was
invested in Mr. Tweed's reflection, that the
was acquired, by gift, makes any difference,
that Mr. Tweed may dispose of the property,
is no less true as respects any other
person who becomes bail for another, and
have no right to assume that he who stands before
me as a young man who I must believe to be of good
character,—because the counsel had the right to show
the reverse if it were true, and they have not at-

tempted to do so—means to do a dishonorable thing, or to dispose of his property in any other than a legitimate manner and for a proper consideration which, as I have before remarked, is what any one might do. The possibility that sureties may sell or dispose of their property is a risk incident to making bonds or notes, but it is a risk that the law says must be borne. I think the sureties justify within the requirements of the statute. The "residents and either the householders or freeholders in this State," and the "whole jurisdiction," as it is

ent to that of two sufficient bail" in the required amount, and therefore it is my duty to approve the undertaking. But before doing so I think I have the right and ought to require that all the deeds not yet recorded should be left at the Register's office or record. Upon that being done I will approve the undertaking.

The last provision has been complied with and the deeds placed on record in the Register's office. The undertaking has also been approved, Mr. Millard

THE COLUMBIA TRIALS.

The Grand Jury sits for a few days longer. No decision has yet been made in the McMas case.